

14035. Supplement to Notice of Judgment No. 12419. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 378 Cases and 297 Cases of Salmon. Decree entered, ordering portion of product released under bond. (F. & D. Nos. 14237, 14238. I. S. Nos. 10530-t, 10532-t. S. Nos. W-844, W-845.)

Subsequent to the entry of the decree of March 3, 1924, ordering that the product in the above case be condemned, forfeited, and delivered to the State of Washington Fisheries Department for use as fish food, the claimant, the Sitka Packing Co., petitioned the court that it be allowed to recondition the 297 cases of salmon labeled "Edgecombe Brand Alaska Medium Red Salmon, Sitka Packing Co." On January 6, 1926, the Supervisor of the Bureau of Fisheries of the State of Washington having signified his willingness to surrender the said salmon, it was ordered by the court that it be delivered to the claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,500, in conformity with section 10 of the act. The said bond provided that the claimant separate the portion of the salmon which was not adulterated from the portion which was unfit for human consumption and that the unadulterated salmon be released to the claimant and the remainder destroyed in the process of reconditioning.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14036. Misbranding and alleged adulteration of vinegar. U. S. v. 65 Barrels of Apple Cider Vinegar. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture entered. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 15322. I. S. No. 5098-t. S. No. E-3545.)

On or about August 19, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Vermont, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 65 barrels of vinegar, remaining in the original unbroken packages at St. Johnsbury, Vt., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Douglas Packing Co., from Canastota, N. Y., on or about July 22, 1921, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Vermont, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Apple Cider Vinegar."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that vinegar made from dried apple product had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement "Excelsior Brand Apple Cider Vinegar Made From Selected Apples Reduced To 4½ Per Centum," borne on the labels, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of and offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On January 29, 1925, the Douglas Packing Co., Rochester, N. Y., having appeared as claimant for the property, judgment was entered, finding the product misbranded and ordering its condemnation and forfeiture, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$200, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

4037. Adulteration and misbranding of morphine sulphate tablets, atropine sulphate tablets, nitroglycerin tablets, and strychnine sulphate tablets. U. S. v. the Maltbie Chemical Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 18997. I. S. Nos. 575-v, 2328-v, 2330-v, 2332-v, 2853-v.)

On December 13, 1924, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Maltbie Chemical Co., a corporation, Newark, N. J., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, in various consignments, namely, on or about September 25, 1923, and December 4, 1923, respectively, from the State of New Jersey into the State of New York, of quantities of morphine sulphate tablets, atropine sulphate tablets, and nitroglycerin tablets, and on or about October 18, 1923, from the State of New Jersey into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of strychnine sulphate tablets all of which were adulterated and misbranded. The articles were labeled in part, variously: "Tablets Poison Morphine Sulphate 1-2 gr.;"

"Tablets Morphine Sulph., 1-8 gr.;" "Tablets Atropine Sulph. 1-100 gr.;" "Tablets Nitroglycerin 1-100 gr.;" "Tablets Strych. Sulph. 1-100 gr." The articles were further labeled, "The Maltbie Chemical Co. Newark, N. J."

Analysis by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of samples of the articles showed that: The morphine sulphate tablets labeled " $\frac{1}{2}$ gr." contained $\frac{4}{9}$ grain of morphine sulphate per tablet and those labeled " $\frac{1}{8}$ gr." contained $\frac{1}{10}$ grain of morphine sulphate per tablet; the atropine sulphate tablets, labeled " $\frac{1}{100}$ gr.," contained $\frac{1}{125}$ grain of atropine sulphate per tablet; the nitroglycerin tablets, labeled " $\frac{1}{100}$ gr." contained $\frac{1}{147}$ grain of nitroglycerin each; and the strychnine sulphate tablets, labeled " $\frac{1}{100}$ gr.," contained $\frac{1}{138}$ grain of strychnine sulphate each.

Adulteration of the articles was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that their strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which they were sold, in that the labels represented the said tablets to contain $\frac{1}{2}$ grain of morphine sulphate, $\frac{1}{8}$ grain of morphine sulphate, $\frac{1}{100}$ grain of atropine sulphate, $\frac{1}{100}$ grain of nitroglycerin, or $\frac{1}{100}$ grain of strychnine sulphate, as the case might be, whereas each of said tablets contained less of the product than represented on the label thereof.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Tablets Morphine Sulphate 1-2 gr.," "Tablets Morphine Sulph. 1-8 gr.," "Tablets Atropine Sulph. 1-100 gr.," "Tablets Nitroglycerin 1-100 gr." and "Tablets Strych. Sulph. 1-100 gr.," as the case might be, borne on the labels of the respective products, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that each of said tablets contained the amount of the product declared on the label thereof, whereas the said tablets contained less than so declared.

On September 28, 1925, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14038. Adulteration and misbranding of milk chocolate bars. U. S. v. Norma Chocolate Co., Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 15426. I. S. No. 7833-t.)

On May 31, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Norma Chocolate Co., Inc., a corporation, Brooklyn, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about May 10, 1920, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of milk chocolate bars which were adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Regal Milk Chocolate Bars Manufactured By Norma Chocolate Co., Inc. Brooklyn, N. Y."

Analysis by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of a sample of the article showed that it had been made with skim milk.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, skim milk, had been substituted in part for milk chocolate, to wit, a product composed in part of whole milk, which the said article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Milk Chocolate," borne on the boxes containing the article, was false and misleading, in that the said statement represented that the article consisted wholly of milk chocolate, to wit, a product composed in part of whole milk, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it consisted wholly of milk chocolate, to wit, a product composed in part of whole milk, whereas it did not so consist but did consist of a product composed in part of skim milk. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, milk chocolate.

On January 6, 1926, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*